



AIRPOWER in the news

STATINTL

By Claude Witze

SENIOR EDITOR, AIR FORCE MAGAZINE

CPYRGHT

James Forrestal, the Oracle

WASHINGTON, D. C.

On the seventh day of February 1947, James Forrestal noted in his diary that he had lunched with Arthur Krock of the *New York Times* and Congressman Clarence Brown of Ohio. There was some discussion about the Universal Military Training program. The Congressman said a UMT bill could not pass Congress. He did recognize the changing nature of the national defense problem and expressed the opinion that there should be closer liaison, in this kind of an era, between the armed services and industry and a more adequate program for the development of technicians.

Then, wrote Mr. Forrestal:

"I said that the Navy was moving along all of these lines and I believed the Army was also. . . . I said that sometime we would have to look to him for a defense of these activities . . . that at sometime in the not-too-distant future I foresaw the recurrence of attacks such as the Nye investigation, to prove that the Army and Navy and American business were combining on a neofascist program of American imperialism, thought domination, etc."

On that day in 1947 Mr. Forrestal was Secretary of the Navy and destined, in a few months, to be the first Secretary of Defense. It was during his days in the Pentagon—he served, in all, from 1940 to 1949—that the United States, facing a prolonged military menace in an era of uneasy peace, turned to the military-industry team concept for the maintenance of its arsenal. Mr. Forrestal played a key role in this decision and still is honored as the father of the National Security Industrial Association, a defense contractor organization which he recommended as a source of "disinterested advice on research, manufacturing, and procurement."

It is an odd juxtaposition of history that when the Secretary predicted a Nye-type attack on the system and told Mr. Brown it would need defending, he already was an old acquaintance of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Army Chief of Staff who later was to become President. In the years ahead, from his platform at the White House, Mr. Eisenhower provided major stimulation to all efforts to discredit the military-industry team approach to national security. The record on this ran from 1953, when he first voiced apprehension about the size of the military budget, to his swan song last January, when he talked about the "military-industry complex" and warned of its "unwarranted influence."

It was early in 1959 that Mr. Eisenhower warned of our trend, as he saw it, toward a "garrison state." A short time later he said "something besides the strict military needs of this country" was influencing decisions and here was credited with helping to start the Hébert Subcommittee investigation of retired officers who accepted jobs with defense contractors. That hearing, which simmered away during the summer months, touched on many aspects of the military-industry team approach but produced no real evidence of misconduct.

But the report, in the sense that Mr. Forrestal foresaw

CPYRGHT

an attempt to prove that the military-industry team is a self-seeking cabal, a modern merchants-of-death combine, continue and intensify in fury.

The most elaborate effort to date appeared in *The Nation* for October 28, a sixty-four-page special issue entitled: "Juggernaut: The Welfare State." The author, Fred J. Cook, has made previous reports of this magnitude for *The Nation* on the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Central Intelligence Agency. He also has written a book about Alger Hiss, who was a member of the Nye

It is the American way to depend heavily on what we call "industry." Our total national effectiveness is deeply rooted in the utilization of the initiative, competence, and resources of private industry. As World War II so vividly illustrated, the total national strength which we can mobilize in time of emergency rests primarily upon the productive capability of an industrial complex with motivations of its own. The essential ingredient of that motivation is profit.

We happen to believe—and have demonstrated—that such a system of society is superior in the long run to the monolithic structure which sometimes seems so effective and efficient under conspiratorial control—terribly efficient in the hands of an adversary holding to a fixed and narrow objective of tyranny.

—EUGENE M. ZUCKERT
Secretary of the Air Force

CPYRGHT

Committee staff—a staff called Communist by Mr. Forrestal—long before he shared the headlines with Whittaker Chambers.

In the entire sixty-four pages of *The Nation* there is no evaluation of the threat or the capabilities of the potential enemy. Such documentation as the Gaither Report, the great broken secret of the Eisenhower Administration, is ignored. Russia's role, in the Cook article, has been that of becoming the menace only when "a menace had to be created."

Cook says the issue is a threat that civilian control of the military is menaced by the military-industry complex as defined by Mr. Eisenhower. He calls this control a "tradition" instead of the constitutional provision that it always has been. At the outset, he associates the complex with the John Birch Society and just as deftly with all opposition to social progress. Defense industry, he charges, is determined to see the taxpayer buy guns, not education; it is for the Warfare State, not the Welfare State.

There is no desire here to dignify the Cook thesis by detailed review and refutation. His quotations consistently are taken out of context and just as consistently distorted in interpretation. He leans heavily on such authoritative publications as the *Congressional Quarterly* but is highly selective in his choice of material. Discussing the Hébert

CPYRG

CHICAGO, ILL.
SUN-TIMESm. 538,780
S. 661,622

Front Page Edit Page Other Page

Date: OCT 18 1964

STATINTL

CPYRGHT

HOKE NORRIS



Critic At-Large

—WHERE RIGHT GOES WRONG

There are thousands, perhaps millions, of persons in this country of ours who would if they could (and they're trying) save you from communism, socialism, Democrats, Republicans, liberals, integration, income taxes, labor unions, public works programs, the Supreme Court, the NAACP, the CIA, the Girl Scouts, the YWCA, the YMCA, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Richard M. Nixon, Lyndon B. Johnson, public schools, Community Chests, old-age pensions, the United Nations, the armed forces, police departments, the postal system, the Atomic Energy Commission, immigration and the fluoridation as your drinking water.

As disparate as that list is, all of its elements share in common the enmity of the extremely conservative and radical right that at one time or another has assaulted all of them. These American rightists, then, would if they could (and they're trying) destroy the America that we know and that, I assume, all of us cherish. And they're conducting their assaults while shouting pro-American slogans. It makes a curious story.

The story has often been told in various books about the right wing. A new and vigorous study of the subject appeared the other day—"Danger on the Right," by Arnold Forster and Benjamin R. Epstein, with a foreword by Dore Schary, national chairman of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (Random House, \$4.95 hardback, \$2.95 paperback). Epstein is the league's national director and Forster is its general counsel, and the book was written, says the report, "as part of the ADL's total public service program." They look close and long at 11 dwellers in the intellectual slums of the radical right—Robert Welch of the John Birch Society; Dr. Frederick C. Schwarz, the Rev. Billy James Hargis, Dr. George Benson, the Rev. Carl McIntire, Dean Clarence Manion, Dan Smoot, Edgar Bundy, Kent and Phoebe Courtney and Willis Stone—and at such extreme conservatives as Adm. Ben Morrell and William F. Buckley, with briefer treatment of lesser personages and organizations.

Danger Has Its Funny Side . . .

THE READER who has kept his political and intellectual wits about him may be amused by part of "Danger on the Right."

Certainly, in the air of mingled dedication and doom that the crusaders of the right manage to engender, a reader may chuckle over the vast sums of money they collect and the

luxury with which some of them surround themselves. The Rev. Mr. Hargis, he of the Christian Crusade, is paid \$500 a week, lives in a \$44,000 home bought for him by his organization, uses \$200 of its funds a week for maid service in the "parsonage," rides in a \$7,500 car bought by the Crusaders and travels in a Greyhound bus that they reconditioned for him at a cost of \$50,000 (steel kitchen, refrigerator, radio broadcasting facilities and sleeping accommodations for five). One would only observe that Paul Revere furnished his own horse.

There may also be an element of indulgent humor found in the odd blending of childishness and mental derangement that marks the far right and its fellow travelers. What the "Danger on the Right" authors say about the young students among the extreme conservatives might be said about their elders as well. "In short," the authors write, "these young rightists believe that there is such a thing as absolute good and absolute truth—and being of tender years, they believe that they have the key to these absolutes and the answers that flow therefrom." They would solve all problems with a single simple solution (invade Cuba). They are not prepared for a life that may perforce be lived out in a dim zone between victory and defeat. They yearn to know once more a nation that can simply send the Marines to Nicaragua, and let it go at that.

. . . Until You Stop And Think About It

BUT THE reader's laughter cannot be sustained. He must let the weight of the movement sink in: Read the list of contributors among wealthy individuals and large corporations that obviously agree with the rightists, and consider the possible impact of the movement upon our future.

Most of its members seem pleased by the Republican nomination of Sen. Barry Goldwater for the Presidency. It was a victory for them, whatever the disclaimers entered by non-right Republicans. The rightists have seen their members and supporters elected to Congress and to other high offices. They are raising up a young generation, undergraduate and post-graduate, that is articulate, intelligent, crafty and dedicated, and that will be with us for a long time to come. The rightists will continue to be a problem for moderate Republicans and for such conservatives as Buckley who must, the authors write, eventually "come to the day when they regard the Birchers, the Crusaders, the McIntires, the Smoots and the Courtneys as millstones of which they must be free."

But, the authors add, the rightists are also the nation's problem: "It cannot afford confusion on the right, and if the confusion persists, the public will in the end reject the Conservative along with the radical. Our democracy needs a conservative faction. Without it, we will be the poorer, but we will survive."

Forster and Epstein believe that the intended victims of the radical right will also survive—our military-foreign policy, the Supreme Court, the income tax, Social Security, TVA, the war on poverty, the cause of civil rights—because American decisions have always been made "at, or near, the vital center—sometimes a little to the left, sometimes a little to the right. For that is where the voices of reason and moderation are heard."